

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-32 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 17-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-11, 13, 17-27, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,336,135 (“Niblett et al.”) in view of United States Patent No. 6,718,361 (“Basani et al.”). Claims 12 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Niblett et al. and Basani et al. in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0041147 (“Van Den Oord et al.”). Claims 14-16 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Niblett et al. in view of Basani et al.

Claims 1 and 17 are currently amended. No new matter has been added. For example, the subject matter added to claims 1 and 17 is supported in the Specification at least at paragraph [0036] (“in one embodiment of the present invention, the RM server 22 collects the request context data according to pre-defined logic such that the request context data is relevant to the identified task and the identified and performed core task components”) and [0041] (“in one embodiment of the present invention the request context data as set forth by the RM server 22 defines the peripheral task components performed by the message processor 26”). Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the claim amendments and remarks to follow is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101**

The following rejections are asserted under 35 U.S.C. § 101:

(i) Claims 17-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The rejection is understood to be based on the premise that claims 17-32 are directed to a computer-readable storage medium. It is alleged that the broadest reasonable interpretation of

claim 17 covers non-transitory tangible media and transitory propagating signals, and that transitory propagating signals are considered non-statutory subject matter.

In the Amendment filed October 6, 2010, however, claim 17 was amended to recite in the preamble that “the computer-readable storage medium is not a signal.” Further, it is clear from the specification of the instant application and its prosecution history that the term “computer-readable storage medium” does not encompass a signal *per se* and was not intended to do so. For example, paragraphs [0026]-[0027] disclose several forms of computer-readable storage media, including, hard disks, removable magnetic disks, removable optical disks, magnetic cassettes, flash memory cards, digital video disks, Bernoulli cartridges, random access memories (RAM), and read-only memories (ROM). Signals *per se* are not disclosed in paragraphs [0027]-[0027], or anywhere in the specification, as exemplary of computer-readable storage media. Consequently, it is not believed that the phrase “wherein the computer-readable storage medium is not a signal” changes the scope of the original preamble in any way.

Based at least on the above remarks and the previously submitted amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claim 17 is directed to statutory subject matter, as are claims 18-32, which depend from claim 17. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of claims 17-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

The following obviousness rejections are asserted under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

(i) Claims 1-11, 13, 17-27, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,336,135 (“Niblett et al.”) in view of United States Patent No. 6,718,361 (“Basani et al.”).

(ii) Claims 12 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Niblett et al. and Basani et al. and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0041147 (“Van Den Oord et al.”).

(iii) Claims 14-16 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Niblett et al.

As per claim 1, Niblett et al. and Basani et al. fail to disclose at least the limitation “the server collecting request context data relevant to the request and the identified task according to a predefined logic, the context data comprising rights management data and defining the peripheral task components,” as recited in claim 1. Similarly, Niblett et al. and Basani et al. fail to disclose at least the limitation “the server collecting request context data relevant to the request and the identified task according to a predefined logic, the request context data comprising authentication data and defining the peripheral task components,” as recited in claim 17.

Niblett et al. is alleged to disclose collecting request context data relevant to the request and the identified task at column 7, lines 8-30. Column 7, lines 10-13, discloses the use of an asynchronous request that includes information from an initial client request and an assigned identifier that identifies a session. As disclosed at column 7, lines 21-26, the exchange of session identifiers facilitates distinguishing between concurrent sessions and allows a client to interleave interactions with different applications. However, it is not seen where Niblett et al. discloses collecting this information according to a predefined logic. Further, it is not seen where Niblett et al. discloses that the information contained in an asynchronous request defines tasks or task components that are to be performed, let alone peripheral task components.

Basani et al. is alleged to disclose that the request context data comprises rights management data at Figures 2-3 and at column 16, lines 55-67. However, even assuming *arguendo* that Basani et al. does disclose request context data that comprises rights management data, it is not seen where Basani et al. discloses the other limitations of claims 1 and 17. In

particular, it is not seen where Basani et al. discloses either collecting request context data according to a predefined logic or the use of request context data that defines peripheral task components.

Based at least on the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 17 are patentable over Niblett et al. in view of Basani et al. Claims 2-11 and 13 depend from claim 1 and are therefore also patentable over Niblett et al. in view of Basani et al. at least by reason of their dependency from claim 1. Similarly, as claims 18-27 and 29 depend from claim 17, they are also patentable over Niblett et al. in view of Basani et al. at least by reason of their dependency from claim 17.

Without elaboration, since the remaining obviousness rejections are primarily based on the teachings of Niblett et al. and Basani et al. as applied to base claims 1 and 17, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 12, 14-16, 28, and 30-32 are patentable over the combination of Niblett et al., and Van Den Oord et al. at least by virtue of the above noted deficiencies of Niblett et al. with regard to claims 1 and 17.

It is to be noted that Applicants generally deny, and do not concede to, any statement, position or averment in the Office Action in support of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103, which is not specifically addressed by the foregoing arguments and response. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2788 [300502.01]  
**Application No.:** 10/723,825  
**Office Action Dated:** December 23, 2010

**PATENT**

### **CONCLUSION**

The Applicants believe that the present remarks are responsive to each of the points raised in the Office Action, and respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: March 18, 2011

**/Joseph F. Oriti/**  
Joseph F. Oriti  
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439